DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 005 CS 503 707

AUTHOR Remland, Martin; And Others
TITLE Evaluations of Out-of-Role Implicit Behavior for Male and Female Managers.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (67th, Anaheim, CA, November 12-15, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; Androgyny; *Behavioral Science Research; Behavior Patterns; College Students; Females; Interpersonal Relationship; *Leadership; Males; Nonverbal Communication; Organizational Communication; *Role Perception; *Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; Status

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine whether androgynous individuals would view out-of-role implicit behavior by both male and female managers more positively than would either masculine or feminine individuals and whether low status behavior by the managers would be rated as being more considerate than high status behavior. Two weeks after completing a Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), which includes masculine, feminine, and androgynous scales, 384 college students were given a case study and asked to evaluate the leadership behavior of the manager described in the situation. Based on their PAQ classification, subjects were randomly assigned to one of four different versions of the case--male/high status, male/low status, female/high status, and female/low status--and asked to complete the Leadership Rating Form, which measures the problem solving factor and the consideration factor in management. The results indicated that leadership evaluations were not affected by interactions between the manager's sex and implicit displays of status or the psychological sex of the evaluators. However, managers displaying low status were evaluated as more considerate than managers displaying high status. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EVALUATIONS OF OUT-OF-ROLE IMPLICIT BEHAVIOR FOR MALE AND FEMALE MANAGERS

Martin Remland, Ohio University
Sue DeWine, Ohio University
Carolyn Jacobson, Ohio University
Tricia Jones, Ohio State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martin Remland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to the Applied Communication Section of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, California, November 12-15, 1981.

CS503707

EVALUATIONS OF OUT-OF-ROLE IMPLICIT BEHAVIOR FOR MALE AND FEMALE MANAGERS

Previous research indicates that out-of-role behavior for both males and females is evaluated less positively than behavior that meets sex role expectations (Terborg, 1977; Mai-Dalton, Feldman, Summers & Mitchell, 1979). Males and females alike have identified successful managers as possessing characteristics usually attributed to men in general rather than women in general (Schein, 1973; Schein, 1975). Additionally, male workers evaluate females in out-of-role behavior (i.e. women using a directive, authoritarian managerial style) as least effective (Haccoun, Haccoun, & Sallay, 1978).

This research study was designed to test for differences in perceptions based on out-of-role *implicit* behavior exhibited by male and female managers. Males are perceived to exhibit high status communicative behavior because more males are in positions of high status and females are expected to exhibit low status communicative behavior because more females are in positions of lower status. The question of interest is: How will evaluations of managerial effectiveness differ when males display low status implicit behavior and females display high status implicit behavior?

OUT-OF-ROLE BEHAVIOR

Earlier studies have attempted to identify the expected behavior for both male and female managers. Kanter (1977) contends that women in business must adhere to a model of behavior that demonstrates subjectivity and dependence, while men's expected behavior is tough-minded and analytic, with superior cognitive attributes. Welse (1979) identified expected behaviors of women as more talkative, tasteful, gentle, neat, quiet, illogical, emotional, sensitive and passive than men. Welse also describes expected behaviors for men as

aggressive, independent, objective, dominant, active, logical, ambitious, adventurous, self-confident, competitive, skilled in business and able to make decisions more easily than women. Rosen and Jerdee (1973) suggest that men are expected to show initiative and exhibit behavior characteristic of power and prestige. Both sexes agree that masculine traits are more socially desirable than feminine traits (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman & Broverman, 1968; Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; O'Leary & Depner, 1976; Loring & Wells, 1972).

In a study by Vandever (1977), subjects were asked to rate various personality characteristics on a scale of one to seven. The results showed that those personality characteristics stereotyped as masculine were rated higher, while those stereotyped as feminine were rated lower by both sexes. Spence and Helmreich (1972) suggest that "even liberated women" may try to raise their status by assimilating masculine characteristics and values. Not only are masculine traits considered more desirable, but stereotypical masculine characteristics were found to be more similar to the characteristics of a healthy adult than stereotypical feminine characteristics (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz & Vogel, 1970).

With a specific interest in women in the workforce, Schein (1975) examined the relationship between sex role stereotypes and the perceived requisite personal characteristics for middle management positions. She found that successful middle managers were perceived to possess those characteristics more commonly ascribed to men in general than to women in general. Subjects over 49 years of age were the only group that perceived a resemblance between the characteristics of managers and those of women. Schein suggests that this may be the result of more experience with women managers, which might modify stereotypical perceptions of women. Those feminine characteristics which were

associated with the managerial role included "understanding," "helpful," and "aware of the feelings of others."

Powell and Butterfield (1979) also found that a "good manager" was described in masculine terms. Using Bem's Sex Role Inventory, 684 undergraduate and graduate business students were asked to describe themselves and then to describe a good manager. Although it was hypothesized that a good manager would be perceived as androgynous, subjects tended to describe a good manager as being in the same sex role category as themselves. All subjects, regardless of sex, overwhelmingly preferred a masculine manager. How are perceptions of managerial effectiveness modified when males and females behave in a manner dissimilar to the expected form of behavior?

Rosen and Jerdee's (1973) research examined perceptions and expectations of appropriateness and effectiveness of various styles (threat, reward, friendly-dependent and helping) for both males and females. Males were seen as behaving more appropriately and effectively when they used a reward style and females were evaluated as behaving more appropriately when using the friendly-dependent style. Males, however, scored higher on helping style than did females. Bartol and Butterfield (1976) tested for the effect of sex of manager on evaluations of different managerial styles and discovered that men scored higher on initiating structure and that females scored higher on consideration style and that both were rated lower when they exhibited out-of-role behavior. Results generally confirmed the hypothesis that sex of manager does affect how different managerial styles are evaluated. In Haccoun, Haccoun and Sallay's research (1978) non-management personnel evaluated the effectiveness of three managerial styles (directive, rational and friendly) for both males and females. The directive style was rated least favorable when it was used by female managers.

Finally, Mai-Dalton et al. (1979) found that unemotional, calm behavior was evaluated as more effective and appropriate than emotional, angry behavior regardless of the sex of the manager, although emotional, angry women were evaluated more favorably than males.

Previous research has focused primarily on explicit or verbal cues and descriptions of managerial attitudes in various employer-employee settings. It has attempted to discover if male and female managers are evaluated less positively when exhibiting behavior perceived to be more typical of the opposite sex. The focus in this study is on the implicit out-of-role behaviors for managers (i.e. high and low status cues). Specifically, the present study examines high and low status implicit or nonverbal cues exhibited by both male and female managers.

IMPLICIT HIGH AND LOW STATUS DISPLAY

There is evidence that sex-role stereotyping is based on perceived status differences between males and females. A review of the literature on sex differences in human communication suggests that sex-role expectations are violated when females engage in high status or dominant behavior and males engage in low status or submissive behavior. This occurs because women in our culture are expected to act like subordinates, while men are expected to act like superiors.

Differences in status between superiors and subordinates are signalled by their implicit as well as explicit behaviors. Mehrabian (1981) suggests, for example, that behavior indicative of "fearlessness" will ordinarily differentiate superiors from subordinates. Accordingly, persons of lower status will assume weaker postures, speak more softly, appear more tense, and are more watchful than those of higher status (p. 71). Status is reflected in body relaxation, the prerogative to approach, and territoriality.

Generally, those of higher status are found to act in ways that communicate "disregard" for the time, physical presence, and personal territory of lower status persons (Remland, 1978). Higher status individuals can be expected to pay less attention (Mehrabian, 1968; Jorgenson, 1975; Efran, 1968; Fugita, 1974; Exline, 1972; Ellsworth & Ludwig, 1972), assume more relaxed postures (Mehrabian, 1969; Mehrabian, 1971), be given more space (Lott & Sommer, 1967; Dean, Willis & Hewitt, 1975; Walker & Borden, 1976), invade more space (Goffman, 1971; Minter, 1974; Henley, 1977), interrupt more (Eakins & Eakins, 1967) and talk more (Kleinke, Kahn & Tully, 1979), than persons seen as lower in status.

Implicit behaviors that signal dominance and submission, which differentiate superiors from subordinates, also characterize communication between the sexes. Several recent surveys of the literature on sex differences in communication behavior support the view that males engage in higher status behavior than females (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Henley, 1978; LaFrance & Mayo, 1978). Eakins and Eakins (1978) conclude, for example, that:

> One theoretical thread running through much of the discussion is the concept of asymmetry, or nonreciprocality of behavior, that exists between nonequals in status. Female/male differences have been seen to roughly parallel those between superiors and subordinates in status, suggesting a status and power differential behind the socialization of the sexes (p. 176).

Radecki and Jennings (1980) found sex to be an important status variable in occupational settings. Questionnaire data from 69 male and 88 female university employees revealed important sex differences with regard to various dominance behaviors. Based on a 28-item checklist of behaviors, women were

found to perceive themselves as using less domnance behavior towards their opposite sex co-workers than men. Women also reported using less dominant behavior toward male co-workers than they perceived co-workers using toward them.

Based on implicit cues of dominance and submission, a sex-role stereotype emerges in which women behave like subordinates and men act like superiors. As women move into managerial positions they may be evaluated negatively for conforming to the sex-role stereotype, because submissive behavior generally is not appropriate for individuals in positions of authority. On the other hand, women may also be evaluated negatively if they do not conform to sex role expectations.

The final variable explored by this study that appears to have an impact on perceptions of managerial effectiveness, is the psychological sex orientation of the evaluator.

ANDROGYNOUS ORIENTATION OF EVALUATORS

The evaluation of implicit behaviors displayed by male and female managers may well be affected by the psychological gender of those who do the evaluating. Researchers are now interested in examining psychological gender and its impact on our perceptions of communication behavior regardless of the biological sex of the interactants. The concept of androgyny views traditional sex roles as multi-dimensional and orthogonal rather than mutually exclusive characteristics on a single continuum (Bem, 1974). Androgynous individuals typically demonstrate both masculine and feminine behaviors depending on the situational appropriateness (Deaux, 1976; Montgomery & Burgoon, 1977). Therefore, androgynous individuals ought to be less affected by sex role stereotypes when evaluating managers who engage in either high or low status implicit behaviors.

Thus, the present study examines the relationship between out-of-role behavior for male and female managers expressed through implicit cues and evaluated by masculine, feminine, and androgynous individuals. The specific research question is: Will evaluations of managers be affected by their sex, implicit behaviors, and the psychological gender of their evaluators?

Since previous findings suggest that androgynous persons are less likely to hold sex-role stereotypes than either masculine or feminine individuals, they should be less inclined to negatively evaluate the problem-solving performance of male and female managers simply because the managers behave in a way that violates sex-role norms. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H_1: Androgynous individuals will view out-of-role implicit behavior by both males and females more positively than either masculine or feminine individuals.

In addition, research by Gitter (1968) indicates that "weak" or low status behavior tends to be seen as more considerate than "strong" or high status behavior. Thus, it is expected that managers employing low rather than high status behaviors will be evaluated as more considerate, regardless of their gender or the psychological gender of their evaluators, than managers who act in a high status manner.

H_2: Low status implicit behaviors will be rated as more considerate than high status implicit behaviors.

METHODOLOGY

Three hundred eighty-four subjects volunteered to participate in this study from basic communication classes. Subjects first completed the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) developed by Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1974) which determines a subject's psychological sex (masculine, feminine and androgynous). The masculinity scale consists of instrumental, agentic attributes, "characteristics socially desirable in both sexes but believed to

occur to a greater degree in males" (Spence & Helmreich, 1978, p. 33). The femininity scale is composed of expressive, communal attributes, "characteristics socially desirable in both sexes but believed to occur to a greater degree in females" (Spence & Helmreich, 1978, p. 33). For the items assigned to the masculinity-femininity scale, mean ratings of males and females lie on opposite sides of the midpoint; that is, what is socially desirable for one sex is not socially desirable for the other. This third scale contains both agentic and communal characteristics which are more related to each other than to either of the other two scales.

There are three major reasons for using Spence and Helmreich's Personal Attributes Questionnaire rather than the frequently used Bem Sex Role Inventory. First, Spence and Helmreich (1979) offer a carefully articulated theoretical basis for the PAQ, while Bem (1974, 1979) in contrast, uses an empirical approach. Second, Spence and Helmreich are concerned with personality characteristics, while Bem (1974) leaves some confusion as to whether she is dealing with personality characteristics or behavior. Third, Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1974) address the possibility of social desirability influencing responses to the PAQ. Pedhazur and Tetenbaum (1979) report numerous other problems with the BSRI.

This study used the 24-item PAQ. This shorter form was developed from the original 55-item questionnaire by selecting eight items from each of the three subscales. These items were selected "primarily on the basis of the magnitude of the part-whole correlation between the item and the scale to which it belonged" (Spence & Helmreich, 1978, p. 35). Correlations between the full scale scores and the eight-item version were found to be .93, .93, and .91 for masculinity, femininity, and masculinity-femininity respectively.

Coefficient alphas, based on a sample of college students who were administered the short form, were .85, .82, and .78 for masculinity, femininity, and masculinity-femininity respectively. It was concluded therefore, that the shorter questionnaire was sufficiently reliable.

Two weeks after completing the PAQ, subjects were given a case study and asked to evaluate the leadership behavior of the manager described in the situation. The individual depicted in the case was described as a division manager of the American Automobile Association in a large metropolitan area concerned about the job performance of a male supervisor responsible for dispatching tow trucks and providing information to AAA customers during evening hours. After the subjects read a brief performance appraisal interview between the manager and the supervisor, they were asked to rate the leadership behavior of the manager in dealing with the particular situation.

Four different versions of the case were prepared: male/high status, male/low status, female/high status, and female/low status. The sex of the manager was manipulated by inserting either Mr. Simpson for the male or Ms. Simpson for the female manager into the case. Implicit displays of status were manipulated by inserting submissive behaviors (soft voice, leaning forward, paying attention, looking down, nodding, hesitating speech, and nervous gaze) into the low status case and dominant behaviors (loud domineering voice, leaning back, not paying attention, interrupting, walking around, staring, and invading) into the high status case.

A manipulation check was made on the four versions of the case study to determine whether or not subjects would perceive a difference between the high and low status implicit behaviors embedded in the case. Fifty-eight subjects were asked to rate the male manager using Mehrabian's (1972) six

scales which measure the dominant-submissive dimension of implicit behavior. A t-test indicated that the high status behavior ($\bar{X}$ = 32.6) was perceived as more dominant ($p < .0001$) than the low status behavior ($\bar{X}$ = 22.9). The scale values suggested that "high" and "low" status managers were being adequately described in the case. Reliability for the six scales, using Cronbach's coefficient alpha, was .84.

Based on their PAQ classification, subjects were randomly assigned to one of the four cases. After reading the problem description and the interview between the manager and the subordinate, the subjects were instructed to complete the Leadership Rating Form (Remland, forthcoming) which contains 18 bipolar scale items. The LRF has been found to measure two dimensions of leadership behavior: a problem-solving (task) factor (i.e. organized/unorganized, clear/unclear, well planned/poorly planned, efficient/inefficient, practical/ impractical, concerned with detail/not concerned with detail) and a consideration (relationship) factor (i.e. boosting ego/demaging ego, sensitive to feelings/ insensitive to feelings, upgrading/degrading, treating like a superior/treating like an inferior, concerned with approval/ not concerned with approval).

The LRF was submitted to a factor analysis. The method of factor extraction was principal components, and eigenvalues were set at the 1.0 level. A varimax rotational solution was performed with each item requiring a primary loading of .60 and no secondary loading of .40 or above. Two items (poor/excellent and effective/ineffective) did not satisfy these criteria and were omitted from subsequent analyses. As expected, two factors emerged. The first was labeled problem-solving behavior and accounted for 42% of the variance. The second factor, consideration behavior, accounted for 21% of the variance. Table 1 lists the loadings for each of the 16 items retained.

Reliability of the LRF was assessed using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The problem-solving factor obtained a coefficient of .91 and reliability for the consideration factor was .90.

(INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE)

RESULTS

A multivariate analysis of variance indicated no significant interactions (see Table 2). Leadership evaluations were not affected by interactions between the manager's sex, the manager's implicit displays of status, or the psychological sex of the evaluators. Thus, the first hypothesis was not supported by the data.

(INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE)

A main effect was found, however, for the manager's implicit displays of status $F(2,367) = 76.10$, $p < .0001$. A univariate analysis of variance was performed on each of the dependent variables for the manager's implicit behavior. Managers displaying low status ($\bar{X} = 30.16$) were evaluated as more considerate $F(1, 383) = 147.07$, $p < .0001$ than managers displaying high status ($\bar{X} = 21.05$), confirming the second hypothesis. The manager's implicit behavior accounted for 28% of the variance.

The problem-solving performance of managers displaying low status was also rated more favorably ($\bar{X} = 40.5$) than the problem-solving performance of managers engaged in high status behavior ($\bar{X} = 35.9$) $F(1, 383) = 15.67$, $p < .0001$. This difference explained 4% of the variance.

The means for all of the analyses are reported in Table 3.

(INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE)

DISCUSSION

The results of this study appear to be in conflict with earlier research findings which suggest that 1) out-of-role behavior for both males and females is viewed less favorably than behavior which conforms to sex-role expectations, and 2) sex-typed individuals are more likely to discriminate against persons who violate sex-role expectations than androgynous individuals. How can this apparent discrepancy be reconciled?

It is possible that the managers described in the scenario were simply not perceived as acting in a way that could be regarded as "in-role" or "out-of-role" for males and females. Out-of-role behavior may be an inappropriate characterization for cues of dominance and submission when performed by those in positions of authority. Such implicit behaviors might only indicate that the individual is acting like a superior or a subordinate in the role of manager. Thus, evaluations may have been influenced *more* by leadership-role expectations than sex-role expectations, and the more salient cues might have been seen by evaluators as those differentiating superior from subordinate rather than male from female.

Of course, it is also possible that judgments other than those measured in this study (problem-solving and consideration ratings) may have been affected by stereotypic views. Sharp and Post (1980) found, for example, that the predicted success evaluation of a male manager applying for a sex-incongruent position was adversely affected by sex-role stereotyping, even though several other evaluative criteria employed in the study were not affected.

It is not surprising that low status implicit displays were evaluated as more considerate than high status displays. This is consistent with previous research which suggests that low status behavior communicated regard for the

time, territory and presence of another. More unexpected, is the finding that low status displays were given more favorable ratings on the problem-solving dimension of leadership behavior than high status displays. Thus, subjects tended to evaluate low status implicit behavior exhibited in this particular case as more effective overall (subsequent analysis using the effective/ineffective and poor/excellent scale items confirmed this "global" rating). It seems likely that low status implicit cues were seen as more appropriate, given the manager's verbal behavior, than high status cues. Since the manager's higher status was made explicit in the case (problem description and interview dialogue), implicit displays of high status, communicating dominance, might have been perceived as needlessly excessive and degrading. In contrast, low status implicit behaviors might have served a "compensatory" function, merely decreasing what was already viewed as high status behavior (explicit cues). As a result, the high status manager might have been penalized overall for displaying high status behavior.

The results of this investigation appear to suggest that sex-role expectations regarding certain behaviors may be situational. Sex role expectations may be less rigid, for example, when they conflict with the expectations associated with a more salient role. In this study, expectations were not significant enough to result in sex-role stereotyping. Future research should 1) attempt to identify the conditions under which individuals are not penalized for acting in a way that deviates from sex-role norms, and 2) examine the effects of sex-role stereotyping when the behavior exhibited is more clearly perceived as either "in-role" or "out-of-role."

For women entering managerial positions the findings are optimistic. Women managers may not be discriminated against for engaging in high status

behavior, even though such behavior is a departure from sex-role norms. Moreover, "in-role" behavior for females (low status displays) may lead them to establish more supportive, considerate relationships, without sacrificing their problem-solving (task) performance. Women may thus be in a better position to use the nonverbal mode of communication to "soften" the adverse effect of status differentials, particularly when such differentials are expressed in words.

Table 1

Factor Loadings for Leadership Ratings

Scale Item	Factor 1 Problem solving	Factor 2 Consideration
Sensitive to employee's feelings-insensitive to employee's feelings	.29	.79
*Lowering employee's confidence-Raising employee's confidence	.37	.74
Concerned with employee's approval-Not concerned with employee's approval	.19	.79
*Degrading-Upgrading	.34	.76
Boosting employee's ego-Damaging employee's ego	.27	.79
*Treating like an inferior-Treating like a superior	.20	.77
Recogninzing value of employee-Ignoring value of employee	.37	.74
Practical-Impractical	.68	.40
*Unclear-Clear	.75	.09
Well planned-Poorly planned	.79	.34
Successful-Unsuccessful	.78	.24
*Inefficient-Efficient	.82	.30
Appropriate-Inappropriate	.72	.40
Organized-Unorganized	.79	.27
Concerned with detail-Not concerned with detail	.61	.20
**Poor-Excellent	.71	.52
Well coordinated-Not coordinated	.79	.36
**Ineffective-Effective	-.14	-.12

*item reversed for scoring

**not retained for further analysis

Table 2

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Source	df	F ratio	p <
Psychological Sex	6, 734	1.33	.24
Manager's Sex	2, 367	.24	.78
Manager's Implicit Cues	2, 367	76.10	.0001
Psychological Sex X Manager's Sex	6, 734	1.31	.25
Psychological Sex X Manager's Implicit Cues	6, 734	1.01	.41
Manager's Sex X Manager's Implicit Cues	2, 367	.68	.50
Psychological Sex X Manager's Implicit Cues X Manager's Sex	6, 734	.09	.99

Table 3

Mean Ratings on Leadership Rating Form

	Feminine Evaluators	Masculine Evaluators	Androgynous Evaluators	Undifferentiated Evaluators
Problem-Solving				
High Status Male	31	36	38	36
High Status Female	34	37	34	38
Low Status Male	39	41	43	41
Low Status Female	39	40	36	41
Consideration				
High Status Male	18	20	22	22
High Status Female	18	22	21	23
Low Status Male	30	30	32	29
Low Status Female	29	30	30	28

REFERENCES

Bartol, K. M., and Butterfield, D. A. Sex effects in evaluating leaders. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 446-454.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. Theory and measurement of androgyny: a reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksby-Colten critiques. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1047-1054.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. D., Rosenkrantz, P. S., and Vogel, S. R. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., and Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex role stereotypes: a current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Deaux, K. Women in management: causal explanations of performance. Paper presented at a symposium on "The Professional Woman," American Psychological Association Convention, New Orleans, 1974.

Dean, L. M., Willis, F., Hewitt, J. Initial interaction distance among individuals equal and unequal in military rank. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 294-299.

Efran, J. S. Looking for approval: effects of visual behavior for approbation from persons differing in importance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 21-25.

Ellsworth, D. C., and Ludwig, L. M. Visual behavior in social interaction. Journal of Communication, 1972, 22, 375-403.

Exline, R. Visual interaction: the glances of power and preference. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. J. Cole (Ed.), University of Nebraska Press, 1972, 163-206.

Fugita, S. S. Effects of anxiety and approval on visual interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 586-592.

Gitter, G., and Walkley, J. Nonverbal communication: leadership-follower perception and mode of presentation. Communication Research Center Report, 1968, 19.

Goffman, E. Interaction Ritual. Penguin Press, 1967.

Goffman, E. Relations in Public. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Haccoun, D. M., Sallay, G., and Haccoun, R. R. Sex differences in the appropriateness of supervisory styles: a nonmanagement view. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 124-127.

Henley, N. Body politics: power, sex, and nonverbal communication. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Jorgenson, D. O. Field study of the relationship between status discrepancy and proxemic behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 1975, 97, 173-179.

Kantner, R. M. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Kleinke, C., Kahn, M. L., and Tully, T. B. First impressions of talking rates in opposite-sex and same-sex interactions. Social Behavior and Personality, 1979, 7, 81-91.

LaFrance, M., and Mayo, C. Moving bodies: nonverbal communication in social relationships. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1978.

Loring, R., and Wells, T. Breakthrough: women into management. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1972.

Lott, D. F., and Sommer, R. Seating arrangements and status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 90-95.

Mai-Dalton, R. R., Feldman-Summers, S., and Mitchell, T. R., Effect of employee gender and behavioral style on the evaluations of male and female banking executives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1979, 64, 221-226.

Mehrabian, A. Inference of attitudes from the posture, position, orientation, and distance of a communicator. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 296-308.

Mehrabian, A. Nonverbal communication. Chicago, Illinois: Alderine, 1972.

Mehrabian, A. Significance of posture and position in the communication of attitude and status relationships. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71, 359-372.

Mehrabian, A. Silent Messages. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1981.

Mehrabian, A. Verbal and nonverbal interaction between strangers in a waiting situation. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1975, 5, 127-138.

Minter, L. The effect of territory on dominance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dissertation Abstracts, 1974, 2-B, 35, 1026.

Montgomery, C. L., and Burgoon, M. An experimental study of the interactive effects of sex and androgyny on attitude change. Communication Monographs, 1977, 44, 130-135.

O'Leary, V. E., and Depner, C. E. Alternative gender roles among women: masculine, feminine, androgynous. Intellect, January, 1976, 104, 313-315.

Pedhazur, E. J., and Tetonbaum, T.J. Bem sex role inventory: a theoretical and methodological critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 996-1016.

Powell, G. N., and Butterfield, D. A. The "good manager": masculine or androgynous? Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 22, 395-403.

Radecki, C., and Jennings, J. Sex as a status variable in work settings: female and male reports of dominance behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1980, 10, 71-85.

Remland, M. Considerate leadership and nonverbal displays of status: an interactive process. Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, Chicago, 1978.

Remland, M. Leadership behavior and nonverbal displays of status in a dyadic interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1981.

Rosen, B., and Jerdee, T. H. The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 44-48.

Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., and Broverman, D. Sex role stereotypes and self concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.

Schein, V. E., Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 340-344.

Schein, V. E., The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 95-100.

Sharp, C., and Post, R. Evaluations of male and female applicants for sex-incongruent and sex-congruent jobs. Sex Roles, 1980, 6, 391-401.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity and femininity: their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Spence, J. T., and Helmreich, R. L. The many faces of androgyny: a reply to Locksley and Colten. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1032-1046.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L. Who likes competent women? Competence, sex role congruence of interests and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1972, 2, 197-213.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. The personal attributes questionnaire: a measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. Ms. 617, American Psychological Association, 1974.

Strongman, K. T., and Champness, B. G. Dominance hierarchies and conflict in eye contact. Acta Psychologica, 1968, 28, 376-386.

Terborg, J. R., and Ilgen, D. R. A theoretical approach to sex discrimination in traditionally masculine occupations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 13, 352-376.

Thayer, S. The effect of interpersonal looking duration on dominance judgments. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1969, 79, 285-286.

Vandever, J. Sex typing and androgyny: an empirical study. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 602.

Walker, J., and Borden, R. Sex, status, and the invasion of shared space. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1976, 7, 28-34.

Welsh, M. C. Attitudinal measures and evaluation of males and females in leadership roles. Psychological Reports, 1979, 45, 19-22.